EXHIBIT 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Bartz, et al.,

)

No. 3:24-CV-05417-WHA

Plaintiffs,
)

vs.

)

San Francisco, California

October 10, 2024
) 11:33 a.m.

Defendants.

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ALSUP, JUDGE

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

Official Court Reporter:

Cathy J. Taylor, RMR, CRR, CRC (By Zoom Videoconference) Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Suite 312 401 West Washington Street, SPC 31 Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2151 (602) 322-7249

Proceedings Reported by Stenographic Court Reporter Transcript Prepared by Computer-Aided Transcription

1 APPEARANCES 2 For the Plaintiffs: SUSMAN GODFREY, LLP 3 Justin A. Nelson, Esq. 1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100 4 Houston, Texas 77002 5 SUSMAN GODFREY, LLP Rohit Dwarka Nath, Esq. 6 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, California 90067 7 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP 8 Reilly Todd Stoler, Esq. 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor 9 San Francisco, California 94111-3339 10 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP Rachel Geman, Esq. By: 11 250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor New York, New York 10013-1413 12 For the Defendant: ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER, LLP 13 Douglas Andrew Winthrop, Esq. 14 Estayvaine Bragg, Esq. Jessica Lim Gillotte, Esq. 15 Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-4024 16 LATHAM & WATKINS 17 Joseph Richard Wetzel, Esq. 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000 18 San Francisco, California 94111 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Calling Civil Action 24-5417, Bartz, et al., vs. Anthropic PBC.

Counsel, please approach the podium. State your appearances for the record beginning with counsel for plaintiffs.

MR. NELSON: Good morning, Your Honor. Justin Nelson from Susman Godfrey representing the Bartz plaintiffs. With me from Susman Godfrey is Rohit Nath. With me from Lieff Cabraser is Rachel Geman and Reilly Stoler.

THE COURT: Welcome to all of you.

And?

MR. WINTHROP: Good morning, Your Honor. Doug
Winthrop from Arnold & Porter on behalf of Anthropic. I'm here
with my colleagues, Estayvaine Bragg and Jessica Gillotte. And
then my co-counsel here, Joe Wetzel, from Latham & Watkins.

THE COURT: All right. Welcome to all of you.

All right. We're here for a case management conference. I want -- I've read most of the complaint, but I want to give you a chance to tell me in two minutes, that's it, to summarize your case.

And then you'll get two minutes to summarize your case.

Go ahead.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

This case involves the unauthorized use of hundreds of thousands of copyrighted books that Anthropic is alleged to have taken without permission in something called The Pile.

The Pile is a publicly available source that includes within it something called Books3. Books3 is a pirated database of books. The allegations are that Anthropic took that pirated data source and used it to train its large language model and specifically, because books are incredibly important to train that large language model, it knew that it was a pirated dataset, and it, nevertheless, did it.

The defense that we think is coming is fair use. We do not think that it is a proper case for fair use. The very kernel of what these books are about is expressive content. How you say something is incredibly important. That is exactly what Anthropic does in training.

So this is not something, say, like the Sega case, where the intermediate copying was for the non-expressive content. This is directly for the expressive content. And in many ways this is no different from something like Napster, where, for example, a teenager cannot download something from the Internet and listen to music without infringing the copyright.

Certainly a corporation cannot download a pirated -- known pirated website to its own database and then use it for a commercial purpose.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: A very good, short summary. You get an A plus. I don't have to agree with everything, but you did what I asked. In two minutes or less, you summarized the case.

Okay. Mr. Winthrop, you get two minutes.

MR. WINTHROP: All right. And the bar has been set high, so I will --

THE COURT: Be good.

MR. WINTHROP: Anthropic is an AI research company.

Its core product is Claude, which is a family of large language models. And that's a text-based type of generative AI system that uses deep learning techniques and large data sets to understand, summarize, generate, and predict new content.

Anthropic's Claude models performed tasks -- tasks involving language, reasoning, analysis, and coding, among other things. Its users are individuals seeking help with drafting an email, all the way to businesses looking to enhance their internal functions, create complex financial forecasts, that sort of thing.

The plaintiffs here, as counsel said, are three authors that they say -- they're asserting a single claim of copyright infringement. A number of the AI copyright cases in the Northern District have many, many claims. This has one claim, a single claim of direct copyright infringement. And the claim is based solely on the theory that Anthropic's

```
intermediate use of copyrighted works to teach its generative AI models statistical patterns about how humans use language constitutes copyright infringement.
```

Critically, this is super important when you think about the other AQ -- AI cases around the Northern District and the country. There is no claim in this case that any output ever generated by any Anthropic AI model is substantially similar to any of the copyrighted works.

So this is a classic fair use, a transformation -- a transformative use of taking data, using it to train these machines, to teach it about language, and then something new is created from that.

There are procedural issues in this case in terms of whether they have adequately alleged that, in fact, their clients' books were, in fact, in this dataset.

THE COURT: Well, they do allege it.

MR. WINTHROP: What's that?

THE COURT: They do. They certainly allege that they are.

MR. WINTHROP: They don't -- we would submit, Your Honor, they don't allege it in any kind of way that's factual. And they do --

THE COURT: Why don't you just tell us. Were they or not?

MR. WINTHROP: The -- I don't know the answer to that.

THE COURT: Well, take a deposition tomorrow.

MR. WINTHROP: Yeah, I understand.

THE COURT: Let's find out. I'm going to authorize that.

MR. WINTHROP: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And this is ridiculous for you to hide behind that. Either these books were read and part -- in part of your program or they weren't. And for you to say they got to allege it when it's all within the -- your -- your company's records, I don't stand for that.

MR. WINTHROP: Yeah. What I was -- just to be clear, what my argument is, Your Honor, is they're alleging the books were in a data set, and then they're saying that dataset was used.

Our only point is the dataset is outside, and there -what we're saying is there's no clear allegation that they were
in that dataset that they have access to. That's -- to be very
clear, that's my point.

THE COURT: And is that true, that you don't allege that?

MR. NELSON: We absolutely allege it, Your Honor. We allege it, for example, when we talk about the various plaintiffs.

THE COURT: I read that -- I read that this morning, And it seemed to me you said that all three plaintiffs, their

books were in what's it called Book3.

MR. NELSON: Books3, Your Honor. It's paragraphs 56 through 58 of the complaint.

THE COURT: And -- and so if that's -- why isn't that good enough?

MR. WINTHROP: The way -- Your Honor, the way it is phrased, and I'll go to it, is this. If you look at 56, they say, "Plaintiff Bartz is the author of a number of books," blah, blah, blah. "This novel was included in the Books3 dataset, based on public reporting about the dataset. Pirated copies of her work are available online through websites like LibGen and Bibliotek. Bartz is the author and owner of the registered copyrights works."

So they're citing websites like LibGen and Bibliotek.

They don't -- what our problem is, Your Honor, is that they

don't clearly state, like, they've done their work and they

have concluded that these books are in Books3.

It's a very simple, straightforward argument. If it's -- if they're in there, fine, we move on that -- from that. But that's the critical thing, that the complaint is worded in a very odd way.

THE COURT: But why can't they rely upon public reporting?

MR. WINTHROP: With what public reporting? Can't they -- shouldn't they say what public reporting? I don't

mean -- I don't mean this to be like --

THE COURT: Answer that. Help me out here. What public reporting?

MR. NELSON: The Atlantic Magazine. The Atlantic Magazine has created basically a facsimile of the Books3 database. Prior to alleging these particular books, we ran them through the facsimile of the Books3 database, and all of them were in it. So that is exactly why. We do not have the Books3 -- that's we were careful with what we said, which is the Books3 is Books3, which has its own set of issues, which is a pirated website, Your Honor.

So instead of going to a pirated website, we went to the facsimile of the website, which is the Atlantic database, ran those names through, and saw that they all hit upon it.

And not just that, the LibGen and Bibliotek references are there to show that it is reasonable to expect, certainly way more than plausible to expect that these are in the Books3 database given that they are also in other pirated websites.

THE COURT: Well, wait. I didn't understand the last point. When -- you called something Atlantic.

MR. NELSON: The Atlantic Magazine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So you went to Atlantic Magazine, and all three of the novels were in the list.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Your Honor. Yes.

THE COURT: Is that true?

```
1
              MR. NELSON: Correct.
 2
              THE COURT: All right. So why is that not good
 3
    enough?
 4
              MR. WINTHROP: Because that is not in the complaint,
 5
    and we talked this morning. And if I -- they saw from the
     statement one concern we have, and they told me they were going
 6
 7
     to try to tell me and show me that, in fact, they have this
 8
     evidence.
 9
              I am skeptical, Your Honor, but I'm open-minded.
     don't want to file a motion.
10
              THE COURT: Please don't file one when it's that easy.
11
12
              I want you by the end of the week, show him the
13
    Atlantic list. Highlight the names of the three.
14
              MR. NELSON: Absolutely, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: All right. Okay. Now, do you deny that
16
     your company uses Books3?
17
              MR. WINTHROP: I don't know at this point that the --
18
     the full use of the training, but that's -- so that would be a
19
     question --
20
              THE COURT: That's what's alleged.
21
              MR. WINTHROP: Yes --
22
              THE COURT:
                         So --
23
              MR. WINTHROP: -- I understand.
              THE COURT: -- why don't you go take the deposition
24
25
     tomorrow of a 30(b)(6) person to find out if they're using
```

Books3.

This ought to be -- the facts here should not be in dispute. If it's truly fair use, you should be open about everything that happened --

MR. WINTHROP: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- and -- and so that they -- we -- okay.

Now, what is your answer to his point? His point is, we're not selling pirated copies. We're not going out -- and what's the name of this book? The Last -- the Lost Night, a novel.

They're not going out and selling bootleg copies of this novel. Kind of the classic misuse of copyright.

What they're doing is, he says, a transformative use, the words in that novel and, as you say, the expression to train their -- what's it called?

MR. WINTHROP: It'll a model. Claude.

THE COURT: Claude, yes.

So that -- I can see the argument. I'm not saying I agree with it. I don't know yet. But tell me, preview what your response to that's going to be.

MR. NELSON: Sure. And we'll put aside the output case, whether it actually is transformative. But just this is an input case. The -- the copying of a pirated book is a copyright violation. And the American -- the A&M Records vs.

Napster, 239 F.3d 1004 at 1015, Ninth Circuit, I'm going to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

issues. We do think --

```
motion.
         Now, I might -- I probably -- I won't say I would
automatically go along with it, but I -- but -- but right now I
want to have a date, a deadline date.
         MR. WINTHROP: And so --
         THE COURT: And as we get closer, if you think you
both agree this -- that this is premature, you could probably
talk me out of the deadline.
         MR. WINTHROP: All right. And I trust that if the
feeling of good spirit we had this morning in terms of
agreement somehow dissipates in the case and we can't agree, I
assume we still can come to you and attempt to persuade you
on --
         THE COURT: Yes, you could.
         MR. WINTHROP: -- on the --
         THE COURT: Yeah.
         MR. WINTHROP: Yeah.
         THE COURT: You could always do that.
         MR. WINTHROP: Yeah, I thought.
         THE COURT: Because everyone knows that I'm
Mr. Reasonable.
         MR. WINTHROP: That's why I said it. Yep.
         MR. NELSON: Your Honor, we do actually -- we take you
seriously on taking a quick deposition on -- on some of these
```

```
1
              THE COURT: And I'm serious, too.
 2
              MR. NELSON: Oh, absolutely.
 3
              I do think that it would be more efficient if this
 4
     week or early next week we are able to issue requests for
     admission and interrogatories --
 5
 6
              THE COURT: Yeah.
 7
              MR. NELSON: -- on these issues.
 8
              Thank you.
 9
              THE COURT: Oh, yeah. This -- the purpose of this
     discovery thing, it's open. Today under the rule, discovery is
10
11
     wide open. No stonewalling.
12
              And you could take the -- it's wide open. You could
     take the plaintiff's depositions.
13
14
              MR. WINTHROP: Oh, yeah.
15
              THE COURT: Find out if they really wrote these books.
16
              MR. WINTHROP: Let -- let me just be clear. The point
17
     I was making was, is the -- are there books in Books3?
18
              If that's easily demonstrated to us by what they're
19
     saying, we don't -- that was the only point. We want to -- we
20
     want to get to the heart of this, too, Your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: Well, it could be if you took their
22
     depositions somehow they've given away the copyrights.
23
              MR. WINTHROP: That -- there may be some issues there,
24
    too, Your Honor.
25
              THE COURT: I'm telling you --
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WINTHROP: Yeah. THE COURT: -- half the class actions I've always done, there's always a problem with the plaintiffs that the lawyers have failed to --MR. WINTHROP: Yeah. THE COURT: -- discover. Now, maybe your firms are so great. But I'm telling you they range from convicted felon -- convicted felon. There's no way a convicted felon is going to represent -- have a fiduciary duty unless the whole class is one of convicted felons so --MR. WINTHROP: You just -- just took away one of my motions. THE COURT: All right. MR. WINTHROP: But that's okay, Your Honor. THE COURT: So there. You might want to take their deposition. All right. How much more damage can I do this morning? I'm going to get out an order --MR. WINTHROP: Thank you. THE COURT: -- that captures this. And you owe me a suggested -- I want you to talk about the tutorial. And if you agree, I would like to do it, but I'm

not ordering it yet. But if you both say, we could do this on

January 10th, then I'd probably go along with that.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Your Honor. And we will confer on that.

And I do -- we have talked a lot about Books3. To be clear, our allegation is that they are in the training data for Anthropic. Books3 is the most glaring example of that. But I think, for example, to get around the issue of -- of saying that they do not use it, it would be -- they are not used at the training data whatsoever, it's something that we'll explore during discovery.

THE COURT: You should do a request to admit that said: Admit that you used the Last Night -- Lost Night, a novel, as part of the training.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Your Honor. That's exactly what --

THE COURT: And if they don't admit or deny something that simple, there will be -- you'll be in trouble with the poor judge.

That's something you can admit or deny easily. You probably know it right now. Okay.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Good luck to both sides.

MR. NELSON: Thank you.

MR. WINTHROP: Thank you.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Court is adjourned.

```
(Proceedings conclude at 12:07 p.m.)
 1
 2
                                      ---000--
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, CATHY J. TAYLOR, do hereby certify that I am duly appointed and qualified to act as Official Court Reporter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing pages constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript of all of that portion of the proceedings contained herein, had in the above-entitled cause on the date specified therein, and that said transcript was prepared under my direction and control.

DATED this 10th day of October, 2024.

/s/Cothy J. Taylor
Cathy J. Taylor, RMR, CRR,